UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/536,452	03/28/2000	Ronny Ronen	02207/8754	5160

23838 7590 01/14/2003

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
HUISMAN, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2183	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/536,452	RONEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David J. Huisman	2183	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 March 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5-7,9,11,12,15,18,22 and 23* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Papers Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: #3. Declaration and Power of Attorney as received on 6/2/2000; #4. IDS as received on 3/28/2000; and #5. Change of Address as received on 10/3/2000.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too short (less than 50 words). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Please replace the first occurrence of "truncated" with --truncate-- on page 2, line 22. Also, on page 3, line 18, it is not clear to the examiner if "FFFF:FFFEH" is correct or if it should read --FFFF:FFFFH--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 5 and 6 recite the limitation "the means for extending" in line 1 of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since claim 1 does not include a "means for extending." The examiner recommends changing the dependency from claim 1 to claim 3 for claims 5 and 6 since claim 3 includes a "means for extending."

7. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert --to-- after the word "confined" in line 7 of claim 7. Also, in the same line, please insert the word --space-- after the word "address". Appropriate correction is required.

8. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --space-- after the word "address" in line 2 of claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --at-- after the word "based" in line 2 of claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

10. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --at-- after the word "based" in line 2 of claim 12. Appropriate correction is required.

11. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --to-- after the word "confined" in line 3 of claim 15. Appropriate correction is required.

12. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --to-- after the word "confined" in line 1 of claim 18. Also, in the same line, please insert the word --that-- after the word "instruction". Finally, in line 3 of claim 18, please replace "a" with --an--. Appropriate correction is required.

13. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --at-- after the word "based" in line 3 of claim 22. Appropriate correction is required.

14. Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word --at-- after the word "based" in line 1 of claim 23. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Killian et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,420,992 (herein referred to as Killian).

17. Referring to claim 1, Killian has taught a processor comprising:

a) means for executing an instruction of an application of a first bit size ported to a second bit size environment, the second bit size being greater than the first bit size. See column 2, lines 7-33.

b) means for confining the application to a first bit size address space subset. See column 19, lines 36-40.

18. Referring to claim 2, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 1. Killian has further taught that the first bit size is 32-bit and the second bit size is 64-bit. See column 3, lines 30-31, and column 5, lines 8-19.

19. Referring to claim 3, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 1. Killian has further taught that the means for confining includes:

a) means for truncating generated address references of the second bit size to the first bit size. See column 10, line 62, to column 11, line 5. In this passage, Killian has explained that the 32-bit architecture ignores overflow (i.e. performs truncation) during addition operations. Since Killian's system is backward compatible with the aforementioned 32-bit architecture, it follows that Killian's system would perform the same operations as the 32-bit architecture. Therefore, in overflow situations, truncation would be performed on 64-bit data (since the data path and register size of Killian's system is 64-bits) in order to obtain 32-bit data.

b) means for extending to the second bit size the truncated generated address references. See column 12, lines 45-65. Note that 32-bit data is sign extended for use in the extended architecture.

20. Referring to claim 4, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 3. Killian has further taught that the means for confining includes means for generating an address fault. See column 11, lines 3-5. The 32-bit address (which would be represented as an extended 64-bit number in the 64-bit environment) that is used to select a memory location in the address space subset is checked for a certain value and if that value exists, then an address error exception will occur.

21. Referring to claim 5, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 1. Killian has further taught that the means for extending includes means for determining that the first bit size address space subset is signed address space. See column 19, lines 36-40. From this passage it can be seen that the address space is from -2^{31} to $(2^{31}-1)$ which is also known as –2GB to +2GB.

22. Referring to claim 6, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 1. Killian has further taught that the means for extending includes means for determining that the first bit size address space subset is unsigned address space. See column 13, lines 10-27, and Table 3A. Killian has disclosed Load-Byte-Unsigned (LBU) and Load-Halfword-Unsigned (LHU) instructions, which are zero-extended as opposed to sign extended. As an example, LBU will retrieve an 8-bit value from memory/cache, and zero-extend it to 64-bits, regardless of the most significant bit position. If this unsigned data were then used as an address to access memory, which is possible since Killian has also disclosed indirect jumps in Table 5B (where the contents of a specified register are used as an address to access memory), it would follow that the address space would be unsigned.

23. Referring to claim 7, Killian has taught a processor comprising:

a) a memory to store an instruction of an application ported from a first bit size environment to a second bit size environment, the second bit size being greater than the first bit size. See Fig.1 and column 7, lines 49-54. Note the existence of main memory and an instruction cache.

b) an instruction execution core coupled to said memory, said instruction execution core to execute the instruction of the application. See Fig.1. Note that data and instructions are retrieved from memory/cache by the EIC (component 25) and propagated along bus 30 to the execution unit.

c) said instruction execution core to determine that the application is confined to a first bit size address space subset. See column 19, lines 36-40.

d) said instruction execution core to generate an address reference of the second bit size as part of execution of the instruction. See column 12, lines 26-65.

e) said instruction execution core to truncate the generated address reference from the second bit size to the first bit size. See column 10, line 62, to column 11, line 5. In this passage, Killian has explained that the 32-bit architecture ignores overflow (i.e. performs truncation) during addition operations. Since Killian's system is backward compatible with the aforementioned 32-bit architecture, it follows that Killian's system would perform the same operations as the 32-bit architecture. Therefore, in overflow situations, truncation would be performed on 64-bit data (since the data path and register size of Killian's system is 64-bits) in order to obtain 32-bit data.
f) said instruction execution core to extend the truncated, generated address reference from the first bit size to the second bit size. See column 12, lines 45-65. Note that 32-bit data is sign extended for use in the extended architecture.

24. Referring to claim 8, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 7. Killian has further taught that the application ported from a first bit size environment to a second bit size environment is an application ported from a 32-bit environment to a 64-bit environment. See column 3, lines 30-31, and column 5, lines 8-19.

25. Referring to claim 9, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 7. Killian has further taught that the instruction execution core is to determine that the application is confined to a first bit size address subset based at least in part on an address space control flag. See column 17, lines 25-27. Note from columns 17-19, that based on the different modes, different address space subsets are used.

26. Referring to claim 10, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 7. Killian has further taught that the instruction execution core is to extend the truncated, generated address reference from the first bit size to the second bit size based at least in part on an address format

control flag. See column 17, lines 27-31. Note that if the "address format control flag" specifies 32-bit mode, the addresses are sign-extended from 32 bits to 64 bits. In 64-bit mode, no sign extension occurs.

27. Referring to claim 11, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 7. Killian has further taught that the instruction execution core is to generate an address fault flag based least in part on a comparison of the generated address reference and the extended, truncated, generated address reference. Recall from previous rejections that a generated 32-bit number is extended to a 64-bit number in Killian's system. From column 17, line 61, to column 18, line 7, Killian has disclosed that bit 31 of the 64-bit number is checked. If that value is 0, then an address fault has not occurred. However, if that value is 1, then an address exception has occurred. Bit 31, in a sense, represents an overflow bit in that when that bit is set, then the 32-bit application has crossed the 32-bit address space boundary and a fault has occurred. It should be noted that a comparison would inherently be performed to check bit 31. And, this comparison is related to both the original 32-bit address and the extended 64-bit version.

28. Referring to claim 12, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 11. Killian has further taught that the instruction execution core is to generate an address fault flag based least in part on an address fault control flag. See Fig.5E. In the upper-right corner of the figure, different types of address faults (R3ERR, R2ERR, R1ERR, and R0ERR) are coupled to a multiplexer which is controlled by an address fault control flag VA(63..62). This value is used to help generate an address fault flag (output line denoted as ADDRESS ERROR), if one exists for the corresponding mode.

29. Referring to claim 13, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 7. Killian has further taught that the memory is a cache memory. See column 7, lines 50-52.

30. Referring to claim 14, Killian has taught a processor as described in claim 7. Killian has further taught that the processor is a 64-bit processor. See column 2, lines 16-41, and column 3, lines 30-31. Killian has disclosed that the registers and data path, along with memory addresses, are 64 bits wide. Therefore, Killian has taught a 64-bit processor.

31. Referring to claim 15, Killian has taught a method to confine an application to an address space subset, the method comprising the steps performed by the processor of claim 7. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

32. Referring to claim 16, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 15. Furthermore, claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 7 and 8.

33. Referring to claim 17, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 16. Furthermore, claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

34. Referring to claim 18, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 15. Furthermore, claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 9.

35. Referring to claim 19, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 15. Furthermore, claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

36. Referring to claim 20, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 15. Killian has further taught that extending the truncated, generated address reference from the first bit size to the second bit size includes sign-extending the truncated, generated address reference from the first bit size to the second bit size based at least in part on an address format control flag. See

column 17, lines 27-31. Note that if the "address format control flag" specifies 32-bit mode, the addresses are sign-extended from 32 bits to 64 bits. In 64-bit mode, no sign extension occurs.

37. Referring to claim 21, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 15. Killian has further taught that extending the truncated, generated address reference from the first bit size to the second bit size includes zero-extending the truncated, generated address reference from the first bit size to the second bit size based at least in part on an address format control flag. Recall from the rejection of claim 6 that the LBU and LHU instructions involve unsigned data (which can be used as an address) that is zero-extended as opposed to sign extended. Furthermore, the processor will know to zero-extend such unsigned data when it encounters the appropriate opcode. The opcode's unique value will tell the system to use zero-extended, unsigned data. Therefore, the opcode is considered to be an address format control flag.

38. Referring to claim 22, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 15. Furthermore, the processor of claim 11 performs the method of claim 22. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 11.

39. Referring to claim 23, Killian has taught a method as described in claim 22. Furthermore, the processor of claim 12 performs the method of claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 12.

Conclusion

40. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the

references cited and the objections made. Applicant must also show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

Hammond et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,638,525, has taught a processor capable of executing programs that contain RISC and CISC instructions. More specifically, Hammond et al. has taught a system in which 32 and 64-bit instructions can exist within the same program where each ISA has an instruction that tells the processor to start executing in the other mode.

Hammond et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,774,686, has taught a method and apparatus for providing two system architectures in a processor. More specifically, a 32 and 64-bit system is described along with the use of flags to switch between the two architectures.

Sakamura et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,140,684, has taught an access privilege-checking apparatus and method. This patent shows an address space extension from 32 bits to 64 bits and discloses the use of unsigned numbers as well as sign extension.

Hennessy and Patterson, Computer Architecture - A Quantitative Approach, 2nd Edition, pg. A-8 to A-11, has taught the advantages of using unsigned numbers in address manipulation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Huisman whose telephone number is (703) 305-7811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (703) 305-9712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

DJH
David J. Huisman
January 8, 2003

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100